

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
 RICHARD J. POCKER (NV Bar No. 3568)
 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 800
 Las Vegas, NV 89101
 Telephone: (702) 382-7300
 Facsimile: (702) 382-2755
 rpocker@bsfllp.com

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
 WILLIAM ISAACSON (*pro hac vice*)
 KAREN DUNN (*pro hac vice*)
 5301 Wisconsin Ave, NW
 Washington, DC 20015
 Telephone: (202) 237-2727
 Facsimile: (202) 237-6131
 wisaacson@bsfllp.com
 kdunn@bsfllp.com

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (*pro hac vice*)
 KIERAN P. RINGGENBERG (*pro hac vice*)
 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900
 Oakland, CA 94612
 Telephone: (510) 874-1000
 Facsimile: (510) 874-1460
 sholtzman@bsfllp.com
 kringgenberg@bsfllp.com

Attorneys for Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle
 America, Inc., and Oracle International
 Corporation

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
 THOMAS S. HIXSON (*pro hac vice*)
 KRISTEN A. PALUMBO (*pro hac vice*)
 One Market Street
 Spear Street Tower
 San Francisco, CA 94105
 Telephone: (415) 442-1000
 Facsimile: (415) 442-1001
 thomas.hixson@morganlewis.com
 kristen.palumbo@morganlewis.com

DORIAN DALEY (*pro hac vice*)
 DEBORAH K. MILLER (*pro hac vice*)
 JAMES C. MAROULIS (*pro hac vice*)
 ORACLE CORPORATION
 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7
 Redwood City, CA 94070
 Telephone: (650) 506-4846
 Facsimile: (650) 506-7114
 dorian.daley@oracle.com
 deborah.miller@oracle.com
 jim.maroulis@oracle.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;
 ORACLE AMERICA, INC. a Delaware
 corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL
 CORPORATION, a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation;
 SETH RAVIN, an individual,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-00106-LRH-PAL

**PLAINTIFFS ORACLE'S MOTION
 TO SEAL THEIR OPPOSITION TO
 DEFENDANTS RIMINI STREET,
 INC.'S AND SETH RAVIN'S
 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
 ON THE ADMISSIBILITY OF
 THEIR POST-2011 CONDUCT**

Judge: Hon. Larry R. Hicks

Pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order governing confidentiality of documents entered by the Court on May 21, 2010, Dkt. 55 (“Protective Order”), and Rules 5.2 and 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and Oracle International Corporation (together “Oracle” or “Plaintiffs”) respectfully request that the Court order the Clerk of the Court to file under seal an unredacted copy of Oracle’s Motion to Seal Their Opposition to Rimini’s Motion for Reconsideration on the Admissibility of Their Post-2011 Conduct (“Motion”) and Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Kieran P. Ringgenberg in Support of Plaintiffs Oracle’s Opposition to Rimini’s Motion for Reconsideration on the Admissibility of Their Post-2011 Conduct (“Ringgenberg Declaration”). Unredacted copies of the Motion and Exhibit 1 were individually lodged under seal with the Court on September 30, 2015.

Sealing of the unredacted Motion and Exhibit 1 is requested because the redacted portions contain information that Rimini Street, Inc. and Seth Ravin (collectively the “Defendants”) have designated as “Confidential Information” and “Highly Confidential Information – Attorneys’ Eyes Only” under the terms of the Protective Order. The Protective Order states, “Counsel for any Designating Party may designate any Discovery Material as ‘Confidential Information’ and ‘Highly Confidential Information – Attorneys’ Eyes Only’ under the terms of this Protective Order only if such counsel in good faith believes that such Discovery Material contains such information and is subject to protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). The designation by any Designating Party of any Discovery Material as ‘Confidential Information’ or ‘Highly Confidential Information – Attorneys’ Eyes Only’ shall constitute a representation that an attorney for the Designating Party reasonably believes there is a valid basis for such designation.” Protective Order ¶ 2.

For sealing requests relating to non-dispositive motions, such as this, the presumption of public access to court filings may be overcome by a showing of good cause under Rule 26(c). *See Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass’n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010); *Kamakana v. Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006). Defendants have identified the information redacted in the Motion as well as Exhibits C-E as Confidential and Highly Confidential, and therefore have

represented that good cause exists for sealing those portions of the documents. This is a sufficient showing of good cause to permit a sealing order on a non-dispositive motion. *See, e.g., Pac. Gas & Elec. Co. v. Lynch*, 216 F. Supp. 2d 1016, 1027 (N.D. Cal. 2002).

TESTIMONY AND DOCUMENTS DESIGNATED BY RIMINI AS CONFIDENTIAL OR HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

Rimini has designated the following documents cited or referred to in Oracle’s motion and proposed order as Confidential or Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only:

EX. NO.	DESCRIPTION	CONF. DESIGN.
1	Excerpts from the 30(b)(6) deposition of Brian Slepko taken on August 24, 2010.	Highly Confidential

For the foregoing reasons, Oracle respectfully requests that the Court find that good cause exists to file under seal the unredacted copies of the Motion and Exhibit 1, and to issue an order sealing the same.

DATED: September 30, 2015

BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP

By: /s/ Kieran P. Ringgenberg
 Kieran P. Ringgenberg
 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc.,
 and Oracle International Corp.